

## Remarks

Claims 1-12, 14-23 and 25-28 remain in the application. Claims 13 and 24 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claim 29 is hereby canceled without prejudice. Claim 26 is hereby amended. No new matter is being added.

### *Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 1, 5-7, 10-12, 14, 17-19, 21-23, 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bussiere, in view of Amara et al (Amara), in view of Zhang et al (Zhang), and further in view of Ni.

Claims 2-4, 8-9 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bussiere, in view of Amara, further in view of Zhang, further in view of Ni, and further in view of Liu et al. (Liu).

Claims 16 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bussiere, in view of Amara, further in view of Zhang, further in view of Ni, and further in view of Brown.

Claims 15 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bussiere, in view of Amara, further in view of Zhang, further in view of Regan.

Applicants respectfully traverse each of the above rejections in relation to the claims as they now stand.

### Claims 1-12 and 14

Independent claim 1, as previously presented, recites as follows.

1. A method for remote mirroring of network traffic between a first network layer 2 domain and a second network layer 2 domain, the method comprising:  
receiving by an entry device a data packet to be remotely mirrored from the first network layer 2 domain, wherein the entry device is pre-configured with a destination Internet

Protocol (IP) address to which to mirror the data packet, and the destination IP address is associated with a remote exit device in the second network layer 2 domain; generating and adding an IP header to IP encapsulate the data packet, wherein the IP header includes the destination IP address; forwarding the IP-encapsulated packet to an exit device associated with the destination IP address; and configuring the entry device in a **best effort** mirroring mode to reduce head-of-line blocking.

(Emphasis added.)

As shown above, claim 1 recites that “the entry device is **pre-configured** with a destination Internet Protocol (IP) address to which to **mirror** the data packet” (emphasis added). In addition, claim 1 recites, “configuring the entry device in a **best effort** **mirroring mode** to reduce head-of-line blocking.”

First, in relation to the claim element that “the entry device is **pre-configured** with a destination Internet Protocol (IP) address to which to **mirror** the data packet”, the office action cites to col. 9, lines 20-24 of Zhang. Neither Bussiere, nor Amara, nor Ni is cited in relation to this claim element.

Col. 9, lines 20-24 of Zhang states, “Once the Layer 2 tunnel is setup and a necessary link is established, the LNS typically assigns an IP address to an authenticated client, and sends it to the network access device over the Layer 2 tunnel. The network access device receives the IP address and transfers it to the client (129).” In this citation to Zhang, there is *no mention, nor any hint, of pre-configuring a device with an IP address to which to mirror a data packet*. In fact, neither “pre-configuring” nor “mirror” is mentioned. Moreover, the Zhang reference does not even pertain to mirroring, rather Zhang relates to providing network access to PPP clients. (See the title of Zhang, for example.)

Therefore, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the claim element that “the entry device is **pre-configured** with a destination Internet Protocol (IP) address to which to **mirror** the data packet” (emphasis added).

Second, in relation to the claim element of “configuring the entry device in a best effort **mirroring mode** to reduce head-of-line blocking,” the office action cites to col. 7, lines 17-29 of Ni. Neither Bussiere, nor Amara, nor Zhang is cited in relation to this claim element.

Col. 7, lines 17-29 of Ni recites “best effort **starvation**” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the discussion in Ni in relation to best effort starvation does not disclose or suggest the claimed best effort **mirroring mode**. In fact, the Ni reference does not even pertain to mirroring. Rather, Ni pertains to “a method for prioritizing packet flows within a switching network.” (Abstract.)

Therefore, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the claim element of “configuring the entry device in a best effort **mirroring mode** to reduce head-of-line blocking” (emphasis added).

For at least the above-discussed reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 overcomes its rejection.

Claims 2-12 and 14 depend from claim 1. Hence, for at least the above-discussed reasons, claims 2-12 and 14 also overcome their rejections.

### Claims 15-17

Independent claim 15 recites that “the entry device is **pre-configured** with a destination Internet Protocol (IP) address to which to **mirror** the data packet.” (Emphasis added.) In contrast, there is *no mention, nor any hint*, in the Zhang citation of **pre-configuring** a device with an IP address to which to **mirror** a data packet. In fact, neither “pre-configuring” nor “mirror” is mentioned. Moreover, the Zhang reference does not even pertain to mirroring, rather Zhang relates to providing network access to PPP clients. (See the title of Zhang, for example.)

For at least the above-discussed reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 overcomes its rejection.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15. Hence, for at least the above-discussed reasons, claims 16 and 17 also overcome their rejections.

Claims 18-23 and 25

Independent claim 18 recites that “the device includes a best effort **mirroring mode** to reduce head-of-line blocking.” Ni is cited in relation to this claim element.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of Ni (col. 7, lines 17-29) recites “best effort **starvation**” (emphasis added), but it does not disclose or suggest a best effort **mirroring mode**.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 overcomes its rejection.

Claims 19-23 and 25 depend from claim 18. Hence, for at least the above-discussed reasons, claims 19-23 and 25 also overcome their rejections.

Claims 26-28

Independent claim 26 recites “a remote **mirroring** engine configured to ... forward the IP-encapsulated packets towards a **pre-configured IP destination** ....” (Emphasis added.)

In relation to a similar element (“the entry device is pre-configured with a destination Internet Protocol (IP) address to which to mirror the data packet”) in claim 1, the office action cites to col. 9, lines 20-24 of Zhang. This citation to Zhang states, “Once the Layer 2 tunnel is setup and a necessary link is established, the LNS typically assigns an IP address to an authenticated client, and sends it to the network access device over the Layer 2 tunnel. The network access device receives the IP address and transfers it to the client (129).” In this citation, there is *no mention, nor any hint, of pre-configuring a device with an IP address to which to mirror a data packet*. In fact, neither “pre-configuring” nor “mirror” is mentioned.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 overcomes its rejection.

Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26. Hence, for at least the above-discussed reasons, claims 27 and 28 also overcome their rejections.

Conclusion

For the above-discussed reasons, applicant believes that the pending claims overcome the rejections of the latest office action. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (Hewlett Packard).

Finally, the Examiner is invited to call the below-signed attorney at the telephone number indicated below if there are any questions with this submission.

Respectfully Submitted,

BRUCE E. LAVIGNE ET AL.

Dated: June 30, 2008

/James K. Okamoto, Reg. No. 40,110/  
 James K. Okamoto, Reg. No. 40,110  
 Okamoto & Benedicto LLP  
 P.O.Box 641330  
 San Jose, CA 95164-1330  
 Tel: (408) 436-2111  
 Fax: (408) 436-2114

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including the enclosures identified herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. If the Express Mail Mailing Number is filled in below, then this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service pursuant to 37 CFR 1.10.			
Signature:			
Typed or Printed Name:	Dated: 6/30/2008		
Express Mail Mailing Number (optional):			